

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LAUREN HUGHES, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

APPLE, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 22-cv-07668-VC (TSH)


**DISCOVERY ORDER**

Re: Dkt. No. 203

The Court appreciates the parties' status report at ECF No. 203 and has now reviewed the binders. There is something wrong with Apple Ex. 1 redacted, Apple Ex. 3 redacted, Apple Ex. 4 redacted and Apple Ex. 5 redacted. Apple Ex. 1 unredacted is 256 pages, spanning HEMBDROGERDERICK00000234 to 489. But Apple Ex. 1 redacted is just nine pages drawn seemingly at random from that Bates range. Similarly, Apple Ex. 3 redacted is just three pages, whereas Apple Ex. 3 unredacted is 87 pages. Apple Ex. 4 redacted is five pages, but Apple Ex. 4 unredacted is 56 pages. Likewise, Apple Ex. 5 redacted is five pages, but Apple Ex. 5 unredacted is 140 pages. These are not redacted and unredacted versions of the same thing. Because the unredacted exhibits do not have any highlighting or other markings on them to indicate what was redacted, the effect is that the Court cannot tell what was redacted in Exhibits 1, 3, 4 and 5 that Apple selected. The Court orders the parties to lodge corrected copies of Apple Ex. 1 redacted, Apple Ex. 3 redacted, Apple Ex. 4 redacted and Apple Ex. 5 redacted within five days.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: November 4, 2025



THOMAS S. HIXSON  
United States Magistrate Judge